

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This communication is responsive to amendment filed 4/02/2008.

Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 17 and 18 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 4/02/2008, Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 18 were amended. This action is made Non-Final.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/02/2008 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,466,663 (hereinafter Ravenscroft) in view of Anderson et al. (US 7046789).

As per claim 1, Ravenscroft discloses of “computer program product comprising executable program instructions that when executed by a processor provide an interaction center manager’s graphical user interface on an interconnected display device, the manager’s graphical user interface” by a graphical user interface of a workstation is displayed which is processed by a processor (Ravenscroft column 4 lines 26-40). In particular, “an overview area displaying group statistics that relate to a responsiveness of a selected group of interaction center agents being monitored and that indicate a number of customers present in each of multiple customer queues, wherein the multiple customer queues are organized to accommodate different customer priority levels and are being serviced by the selected group of interaction center agents” by viewing a pop up box with all of the information (Ravenscroft See Figure 5, it is inherent that a queue will have different priority for different users with the customers at the top of the queue having higher priority); “a detailed area displaying a list of each of the user-selected group of interaction center agents being monitored and further displaying for each of the listed agents at least one user-selected individual statistic relating to the listed agents” by monitoring activities of agents upon a display as part of the graphical user interface (Ravenscroft column 1 lines 32-37).

Ravenscroft does not specifically teach a detailed are displaying a list of each agent of the selected group of interaction center agents being monitored and further displaying for each list agent an indication of a skill associated with the listed agent and information relating to the availability of the listed agent during a future period of time. Anderson teaches a detailed are displaying a list of each agent of the selected group of interaction center agents being monitored (See Figures 21 and 22) and further displaying for each list agent an indication of a skill associated with the listed agent and information relating to the availability of the listed agent during a future period of time (See Figure 20 that shows “efficiency” which is a skill and Figure 22 which shows the status and the unavailable time). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ravenscroft with the teachings of Anderson and include a system that shows skill and time information with the motivation to provide the user with more pertinent information on the screen.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Ravenscroft discloses “statistics are associated with user-created profiles that represent different sets of statistics displayed on the graphical user interface” by displaying requested statistical information on the graphical user interface (Ravenscroft column 5 lines 43-45).

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Ravenscroft discloses “the display in the detailed area comprises one or more of the interaction center agent's name, queues, key figures for each queue, statistical measurements and alerts” by

displaying agent's name, statistical measurements, and queues as shown by Fig. 10 in area 92 and 200 (Ravenscroft Fig. 10).

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Ravenscroft discloses "the at least one individual statistic includes a current availability state or a communication state for each of the listed agents" by displaying a view of the agent's state of availability and state of communication as shown by Fig. 11 in area 256 and 260 (Ravenscroft Fig. 11).

Claim 8 is similar in scope to claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and claim 9 contains the same limitations as claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 3.

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and claim 14 contains the same limitations as claim 5 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 5.

Claims 17 and 18 are similar in scope to claim 8; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft-Anderson further in view of Judkins et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,587,556 (hereinafter Judkins).

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of “the at least one group statistics are selected from a group consisting of an average handling time, an average speed of answer, an abandonment rate, an average talk time, an average response time, calls per hour, calls per day, total calls by channel and total calls by state”. However, Judkins teaches of “the at least one user-selected statistic is selected from a group consisting of an average handling time, an average speed of answer, an abandonment rate, an average talk time, an average response time, calls per hour, calls per day, total calls by channel and total calls by state” by having all call statistics available as shown in Fig. 57, Fig. 60, and Fig. 61 (Judkins Fig. 57, Fig. 60, and Fig. 61).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ravenscroft-Anderson with the call statistics teaching of Judkins. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the call statistics available allows for evaluation of call center performance in any call center system (Judkins column 1 lines 44-46).

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and claim 13 contains the same limitations as claim 4 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 4.

Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft-Anderson further in view of Hugh U.S. Patent Application Publication Number US 2003/0137536 A1 (hereinafter Hugh).

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of “the communication state is selected from a group consisting of an active chat state, an active phone state, an active email state, and an active paging state”. However, Hugh teaches of “the communicate state is selected from a group consisting of an active chat state, an active phone state, an active email state, and an active paging state” by providing interaction through email, instant messaging, paging, phone calls, and SMS (Hugh Abstract lines 5-8).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the call center manager of Ravenscroft-Anderson with the interaction of Hugh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the interaction available allows the system to show user of changes or other events by those means (Hugh Abstract lines 9-10).

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and claim 15 contains the same limitations as claim 6 and is rejected under the same rationale as set forth in connection with claim 6.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft-Anderson further in view of Chee et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,526,397 (hereinafter Chee).

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of “receiving a selection of threshold values associated with each key figure”. However, Chee teaches of “receiving a selection of threshold values associated with each key figure” by providing threshold levels for call statistics (Chee column 5 lines 35-46).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the call center manager of Ravenscroft-Anderson with the threshold level option of Chee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the threshold levels available allows for easier indication of changing color for a statistic represented on a display (Chee column 7 lines 54-57).

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of “providing an alert when a key figure exceeds the

selected threshold value associated with the key figure”. However, Chee teaches of “providing an alert when a key figure exceeds the selected threshold value associated with the key figure” by providing an alert in the form of change in color of a statistic or warning sound when a threshold level has been breached (Chee column 7 lines 54-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the call center manager of Ravenscroft-Anderson with the alert option of Chee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the alert available will bring the attention of the graphical user interface to the user (Chee column 5 lines 39-43).

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated but Ravenscroft-Anderson does not disclose of “the alert comprises a visual indication on the display”. However, Chee teaches of “the alert comprises a visual indication on the display” by providing an alert in the form of change in color of a statistic (Chee column 7 lines 54-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the call center manager of Ravenscroft-Anderson with the visual indication option of Chee. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because having the visual indication available will bring the attention of the graphical user interface to the user (Chee column 5 lines 39-43).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 4/02/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to the Applicants argument that "neither Ravenscroft nor Anderson, alone or in combination, disclose or render obvious 'a number of customers present in each of multiple customer queues, wherein the multiple customer queues are organized to accommodate different customer priority levels and are being serviced by the selected group of interaction center agents' as recited in the independent claims," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ravenscroft teaches multiple queues (See Figure 5) and inherently each of those queues accommodates different priority levels (usually a first in first out (FIFO) type of priority).

In regards to the Applicant's argument that "Ravenscroft and Anderson, separately or together, also fail to teach or suggest 'displaying for each listed agent..., information relating to the availability of the listed agent during a future period of time' as recited in the independent claims" the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Anderson teaches the recited features in figures 20 and 22 (see rejection of the claim above). The efficiency is a type of skill. Furthermore the status of the agent shows the availability of the agent for a future period of time (though the user might not know how long that period of time might be). In other words, a user will know that the agent is available now and that he will likely be available for the some time in the future, even if that future is one second.

***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Boris Pesin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174